



MASTER FILE

November 3, 1999

DSSD CENSUS 2000 PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS MEMORANDUM SERIES #G-14

MEMORANDUM FOR Howard Hogan
 Chief, Decennial Statistical Studies Division

From: Martha Sutt *MS*
 Statistical Requirements Staff
 Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Subject: Block Canvassing Processing Activities

I. INTRODUCTION

Block canvassing processing activities occur in the National Processing Center (NPC) upon receipt of completed Assignment Areas (AAs) from the Regional Census Centers (RCCs). The activities of interest include check-in, prep, batching, assignment area review feedback (AARF) and data entry. I have had the opportunity to visit the different processing areas on several occasions. I reviewed some of the Block Canvass AAs as well as observed some of the processing activities.

II. CHECK-IN OF THE BLOCK CANVASS AAs

The check-in process is similar to the check-in of other field materials. The AAs are received, checked-in against a field transmittal and batch summaries are generated. Problems identified between the field transmittals and actual receipts are sent to the AARF unit for resolution. The Block Canvass AAs are not identified on the cover of the binders in which the individual sheet listings are stored. Neither AA nor wave is recorded. Yet, processing is done by wave and the AA is later attached to the binder when received in the staging area of the Data Keying Branch.

The AARF unit reviews three AAs from a Crew Leaders area. There are no printed procedures specific to their review but there is contact with the field when problems/inconsistencies are detected based on the checklist. In addition, if problems/inconsistencies do exist, only the three AAs selected are corrected. The rest of the Crew Leaders work has been processed through the check-in and batched for keying. Therefore, problems detected in the sample AAs are the only problems being corrected. There is not a "repair" process.

The "General AA Review Checklist" contains two items of interest - the AA Map and AA Locator Map are present and the fact that every block number is accounted for on at least one line of the Address Register (AR).

The "Review of the Address Register lines" contains several good checks - one being that Column 5 has an action code; if a "C" action code exists, there is an entry in a field to be changed; if a D2 exists, there is an identification (ID) of the duplicate listing. There are a couple of checks that I am unsure of how the information is processed - that being the correct block number is on the add page and the correct block number is on the special place add page. Another check - the corresponding street exists on the AA map for added addresses - I question whether it is necessary when there is no check that all preprinted street names must be on the map. (Note: all street names preprinted in the AA book do not appear on the corresponding block map.)

Probably one of the most interesting aspects of these AARF checks is that they are only done for three AAs in a Crew Leader's area. Therefore, the majority of the books are not reviewed and must be dealt with in the data keying area. One example is a missing block number on an add page. This is a must enter field for a data keyer. Yet other problems would go unnoticed. An example is a valid block number on an add page but not necessarily a correct block number.

I would think the purpose of this review should be to correct problems before data keying. However, I do not think this is being accomplished. The check for the D2 described above sounds good but when it gets to the data capture, the ID is never keyed. Therefore, it seems unnecessary for this check in the AARF area. Question - why is the ID of the duplicate not being data captured?

III. DATA KEYING

The data keying area will question some of the inconsistencies such as a correction action code without a change. Some fields will reject based on the programs such as a missing or invalid block number. These rejects and inconsistencies are then referred to the project planner in the data keying area for resolution. In some cases of transmission problems, work has to be pulled back from the storage area. As indicated above, the case did not reject if a D2 action code was keyed and there was not a reference ID since the ID was not captured. Therefore, there is no difference in the keying of a D1 and D2 action code.

From what I understand the transmissions are in three groupings within an AA based on the program being keyed. During part of this process, the reporting system did not account for transmissions by AA - only programs.

IV. PROCESS FOLLOWING DATA CAPTURE

In the review process of some of the AAs, I think that the following observations should be of concern and be taken into consideration when the next process is implemented.

- Duplicates identified by the D2 action code will never be hard deletes if a matching program is used to identify the duplicate address or if deletes are not identified by type. These addresses are primarily different street names/house numbers.
- Some listers included listing outside an AA when the “invisible boundary” was used. Therefore, the address will be added to one AA and probably left as “good” in the other AA. A decision will have to be made as to what AA this address should be geographically located in. Hopefully it will not be retained in both.
- Some transfers, D1 action code and adds do not appear the same way. For example, a case will carry the primary address of the complex/mobile home park name in the add and carry the individual lot/street name in the original listing therefore making it impossible to link the two addresses as being the same in a matching program.
- Duplicates were being created by a correction action code. In a multiunit complex, individual apartment numbers were being corrected. The corrected unit already appeared preprinted thus duplicating some apartments and causing “holes” due to the correction. I do not see a solution for this problem.
- Adds seem to be numerous in some cases. It seems that when resource materials were investigated, some of these streets had been around for some time. Yet, the existing Master Address Field (MAF) did not contain what we found in a 1990 ZIP+4 book. If they were transfers, they were not within the same AA.
- Maps were missing street names, contained incorrect street names and in some cases, the same street name was on two different parallel street segments. (Note: I believe there was an explanation that some printing of street names was not entered on the map due to space allocation but the street did appear in TIGER). It seems like a waste of time to send these maps for updating when the street is already in the system and knowing that it will not print the next time a map is generated due to the same space problem. I do not know how we expected a lister to canvass a block when we do not identify all of the streets we want to canvass in an urban area.
- Transfers observed within an AA - I saw very few but what I observed seem to be identified correctly and could be recognized as a delete in one block and an add to another.

V. WHAT IS INCLUDED ON MAF?

I think it is critical that the process following the data capture is thought through so that duplicates can be identified and sent to the MAF only once in the correct geography. The reconciliation process has to be defined to fit the needs of block canvass. The process used for address listing is not applicable. Some topics to consider: duplicates across blocks (adds to one block- deleted or good in another block, duplicates within blocks (probably mostly D2 and C action codes), and inconsistent numbering system in multi-unit buildings (primarily caused by partial corrections).

cc:

DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series Distribution List

T. John Chesnut

C. Robert Dimitri

Robin Pennington

Kevin Zajac